

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 15, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 8, 13, and 14 are amended; as a result, claims 1-14 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfeiffer (U.S. Patent No. 3,645,015).

Amended claim 1 is respectfully asserted to distinguish over Pfeiffer. Amended claim 1 recites "transforming each of the received words into a unique numeral representation by using an A to Z helix transformation function such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar numerical representations, to avoid ambiguous prediction of meaning of the transformed words in the received text". In contrast, Pfeiffer in col. 1, lines 4-15, and lines 62 and in col. 6, claim 1 describes a Morse code teaching device that merely translates the Morse signals into letters, and finally into words, and vice versa. Pfeiffer does not teach a method of transforming each of the received words into a unique numeral representation using the A to Z helix transformation function that does not result in multiple similar representations as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Pfeiffer does not teach a method of transforming a word, using the A to Z helix transformation function as described-above, into a unique numeral representation. Independent claim 1 should thus be found allowable, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusnick (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,470).

Amended claim 1 is respectfully asserted to distinguish over Kusnick. Amended claim 1 recites "transforming each of the received words into a unique numeral representation by using an A to Z helix transformation function such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar numerical representations, to avoid ambiguous

prediction of meaning of the transformed words in the received text". In contrast, Kusnick in col. 2, lines 7-9, lines 23,24, and lines 47-58, in col. 6, claim 1, lines 33-36, and in FIGS. 3 and 4 describes a technique for encoding a number as a sequence of words. The words themselves are selected from a table of words. Kusnick does not teach a method of transforming each of the received words into a unique numeral representation using the A to Z helix transformation function that does not result in multiple similar representations as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Kusnick does not teach a method of transforming a word, using the A to Z helix transformation function, into a unique numeral representation as described-above. Independent claim 1 should thus be found allowable, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 which is dependent from independent claim 1, should therefore also be found to be allowable, and such action is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusnick (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,470) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chundi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,091).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 3-6 and 8-11 as follows:

Independent claims 1 and 8 are respectfully asserted to distinguish over Kusnick for the reasons presented above. Further, claims 3-6 and 8-11 are respectfully asserted to distinguish over Kusnick and Chundi references. None of these references teach transforming each of the received words, using the A to Z helix transformation function, into a unique numerical representation as recited in claims 1 and 8. Chundi in col. 2, lines 50-61 describes a method for relating user queries and documents by identifying contexts associated with a user query and does not teach transforming a word into a unique numerical representation using the A to Z helix transformation function.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Kusnick and Chundi references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, as mentioned above, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's invention, such as a technique to transform words to unique numeral representations using the A to Z helix transformation function.

For the above reasons, claims 3-6 and 8-11 should be found allowable over Kusnick and Chundi references, and such action is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13 and 14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13 and 14 are dependent from independent claim 1, should therefore be found to be allowable, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 12 were indicated to be allowable for including a mathematical formula which defines the helix transformation function.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 7 and 12.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603) 888-7958 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

RAVINDRA K. SHETTY

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(603) 888-7958

Date 9/15/03

By [Signature]
Prakash Nama
Reg. No. 44,255

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 15 day of September, 2003.

Gina Uphus
Name

[Signature]
Signature